IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 13TH JULY 2007 / 22ND ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 16437 of 2007(F)

PETITIONER:

MISS.FEMITHA ALEX, VARIKAMAKKIL HOUSE,
MRALA P.O., THODUPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.JOHN K.GEORGE

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE VICE CHANCELLOR, PRIYADARSINI HILLS,
M.G.UNIVERSITY, ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM.

2. THE MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR,
PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O., ATHIRAMPUZHA,
KOTTAYAM.

3. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS,
M.G.UNIVERSITY, ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM.

4. THE KERALA UNIVERSITY, REPRESENTED BY
ITS REGISTRAR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.M.RAJAGOPALAN NAIR, SC, KERALA UTY.
SRI. T.A. SHAJI, SC, M.G.UNIVERSITY

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 13/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF B.SC DEGREE.

EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF MARK SHEET IN S.S.L.C. EXAMINATION.

EXT.P3: TRUE COPY OF THE MARK SHEET IN PRE-DEGREE EXAMINATION.

EXT.P4: TRUE COPY OF THE MARK LIST IN FIRST SEMESTER.

EXT.P5: TRUE COPY OF THE MARK SHEET IN SECOND SEMESTER.

EXT.P6: TRUE COPY OF THE MARK SHEET IN FOURTH SEMESTER.

EXT.P7: TRUE COPY OF THE MARK SHEET.

EXT.P8: TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 1.2.07 BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.P9: TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST TO THE FIRST RESPONDENT BY THE PETITIONER.

/TRUE COPY/

PA TO JUDGE.

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)NO.16437 OF 2007

DATED THIS THE 13th DAY OF JULY, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner seeks re-revaluation of her answer paper for M.Sc Electronics Examination. According to the petitioner, she has consistently secured high marks in all examinations from S.S.L.C. onwards and therefore she could not have lost in this particular paper. The petitioner submits that a revaluation was conducted, but she was informed that there is no change of marks on revaluation. Therefore, the petitioner now requests to conduct a further revaluation by an outside examiner. I do not think that the petitioner has shown any special reasons before this Court to adopt that course. The valuation of postgraduate answer papers is itself conducted by two valuers. Even according to the petitioner after such double valuation, a 3rd examiner has revalued it, in spite of which the petitioner could not pass. In the above circumstances, I do not think that I should exercise my discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in favour of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

Acd